

Some 7,100 Vermonters would be cut from the Medicaid rolls between 1996 and 2002 if these changes are approved, says the national Long Term Care Campaign in its study, "Some Cuts Never Heal."

Lyman Deavitt was born in Fletcher, one of nine children: five boys and four girls. He attended a one-room schoolhouse and "just missed graduating from high school in Johnson." When he was a young man, his family moved to Essex Junction.

After a series of jobs at the Park Cafe and the old Oakledge Manor in Burlington and after five years working in Boston, he became credit manager at Flanders Lumber Co. in Essex Junction. He stayed there 15 years until his bout with cancer in 1981 and successive disabilities made him unable to work.

"I tried to go back to work at Flanders after my cancer surgery," says Deavitt, "but I could only manage about three hours a day, and they had to let me go. Then I had to spend all of my money on medical care. I was put on disability in 1984."

Deavitt's mother taught him to crochet after his cancer surgery, and he spends a great deal of his time making afghans. The latest one is going to be raffled off at the senior high-rise on St. Paul Street, with the proceeds going to the Burlington Visiting Nurse Association.

If his benefits from Medicaid are reduced, couldn't Deavitt get help from his family? He has a married daughter in Florida and a grown grandson. "There's no way my daughter can help," says Deavitt. "She's very ill. My parents and my brothers are dead. Two of my sisters have no money, like me. The other two are married, and I couldn't ask them. I'd rather be put out on the street. That's what's happening: The politicians are forcing people to live on the street."

"It's terrifying for me to hear all this talk about cuts in Medicaid," says Deavitt. "If they want to start cutting programs, they should leave the elderly out, the people with disabilities, the children. Why don't they stop the space program instead? To me, this is a bad setup."

A NATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today, Save the Children, the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, and others joined together to launch a national campaign to ban the production, use, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

They spoke of a 2-week conference that has just ended—actually, more than a conference, a gathering of nations—in Vienna, Austria, to reach agreement on ways to stop the killing and maiming of civilians by these indiscriminate weapons.

At that conference in Vienna, officials from governments from around the world, including our own, made speeches about how terrible landmines are. Many of them spoke of the fact that there are 100 million unexploded landmines in over 60 countries, and every day, every 22 minutes, somebody—often a child—is killed or maimed by these landmines. That is 72 people every day of every week of the year. They went on to say how much they all wanted to get rid of them, but. They each had an exception or loophole so their landmines, or their manner of using them, would not be affected.

President Clinton gave a stirring speech at the United Nations last year, where he called for the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines. That was an historic milestone. But in Vienna last week, the United States lagged behind several countries, including several of our NATO allies. While Belgium outlawed landmines and Austria renounced their use and France announced that it would no longer produce them, the United States continued to resist these kinds of dramatic steps.

At least the U.S. Senate, a body that can and should be the conscience of the Nation, voted by a two-thirds majority to impose a 1-year moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines and to continue our moratorium on the export of landmines.

We here in the U.S. Senate took a leadership position that has been applauded around the world. Editorials around the world have said how far reaching we were. A number of countries have even gone farther.

Why did Belgium, a country that sends people for peacekeeping missions all the time, ban the use of antipersonnel landmines by its own forces? Because when Belgium sends peacekeepers, even after the fighting has stopped and the guns have been withdrawn, there is one killer that remains behind—the millions of antipersonnel landmines, each one waiting for a peacekeeper or a nurse or a missionary to step on a pile of leaves or some grass or a road or walk by a watering hole and suddenly lose their leg or their arm or their life. The same happens when a child picks up a shiny object thinking it is a toy and loses his or her hands or face or eyes or life. That happens every few minutes in the 60-odd countries that are infested with unexploded landmines.

Mr. President, much could be done if the United States had the courage to adopt as its official policy the moratorium passed by the U.S. Senate, Republicans and Democrats, some of the most conservative and some of the most liberal. It was a vote that spanned the political spectrum. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer who voted for that.

It is no denigration of any of us that we have differences in political philosophy. We come from different parts of the country and different parties. But we approach this issue with the same humanitarian sense.

This is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. The distinguished Presiding Officer knows from his past experience in the past administration—he knows how volunteers from this country, carrying out the highest ideals of this country, volunteers in the Peace Corps, go to countries like Ethiopia, and Nicaragua, and perhaps even Bosnia someday. What is one of the biggest dangers they face? It is not malaria, it is not dysentery, although those diseases are there. It is that when they go into a village to help

somebody plant a new variety of corn or wheat or help build an irrigation system or teach a group of children how to play baseball, they may not come back alive because of landmines, probably left there by people who were fighting years ago. But the landmines remain.

I hope our country will take more of a lead, that we will start catching up with some of our NATO allies and others who have experienced firsthand the devastation these insidious weapons cause.

I expect we are going to send troops to Bosnia, to fulfill our commitments to NATO. At a meeting of the bipartisan congressional leadership with the President and his Cabinet the other day I said, "If we do send Americans into Bosnia, into the former Yugoslavia, Mr. President, I hope you will do one thing. I hope you will tell the American people that this is not a risk-free operation. That even if there is a cease-fire, even if there is a cease-fire that holds, the men and women we send in there will face one very grave danger—from landmines. Some estimate over 1.5 million landmines are strewn in Bosnia alone." I learned today that there are another 2 million in Croatia.

We need to tell the American people that their sons and daughters may not be shot by one of the warring sides in the former Yugoslavia, but they may be injured or killed tragically by a landmine left behind. And it is quite possible we will not even know which side put it there.

These are the Saturday night specials of civil wars and guerrilla warfare.

So, I applaud those who came together today to renew a national debate on banning landmines. I thank my colleagues here in the Senate who joined to vote for a moratorium on their use. I commend the President for the position he has taken, as far as it has gone. I commend the Secretary of State, UN Ambassador Albright and others who have also, but I urge the administration to redouble its efforts. Only strong leadership, by the world's only superpower, will suffice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the substitute Cuban

Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of which I was privileged to be an original cosponsor, and intend, if I am not, to be a cosponsor of the substitute.

Mr. President, for decades we in America faced down Fidel Castro's threats to our security, and his efforts to spread communism in our hemisphere. The worldwide struggle against communism is over, and democracy and market economies have won. It may be too easy in that global context to simply take Castro and his continued power in Cuba as a curiosity—a harmless relic of a bygone age. But it is much more than that.

His continued governance of Cuba represents the continuation of dictatorship and denial of human rights to the people of Cuba. The valiant struggle of the Cuban people to liberate themselves from the yoke of Castro's Communist regime goes on. We in our turn owe it to them, and to our principles, to remain steadfast in support of their struggle. The Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, of which I was a cosponsor, established a policy, now carried out by the Clinton administration, which is to maintain pressure on the Castro regime for peaceful democratic and market reform.

Mr. President, it is pleasing to note that we are seeing progress as a result of that policy. Without Soviet aid, the Cuban economy continues to deteriorate. With freedom and democracy growing throughout the Western Hemisphere, Castro cannot long silence the voices of the Cuban people in an era marked by a growing wave of self-determination and democracy. The Cuban people will not long be stifled in their desire to realize for themselves the better life that millions and millions more people around the world have achieved within the last decade. So by any reasonable calculus, by any rational predictor of the course of history, the days of the Castro regime are numbered.

The question that the substitute before us poses is should we now relent and allow the Cuban economy to expand? Should we give Castro thereby a new lease on life? Should we leave the Cuban people to suffer longer under what remains as an oppressive regime? Or instead, should we increase our economic pressure on Cuba which is working? Should we renew our commitment to a peaceful transition to democracy and political and economic freedom?

That is the choice we now face. And my answer to the question is to choose the latter course; to increase the economic pressure, and to strongly renew our commitment to a peaceful transition for the Cuban people to economic opportunity and political freedom.

The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act builds on the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992. It is a continuation and a strengthening of a policy that is working. This bill extends the economic sanctions to keep economic pressure on the regime in Cuba. At the same time, it extends a message of hope to the Cuban people by establish-

ing a basis for United States assistance to the democratic Cuba of the future.

Mr. President, the triumph of freedom over communism—the worldwide triumph of freedom over communism—cannot be considered complete while the people of Cuba, our neighbors, remain oppressed by a dictator on their island in our hemisphere.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this substitute. Changes have been made which I think improve the measure from the original introduced, and which I hope will broaden the base of those in both parties who can support this proposal.

Tonight, if that is when the vote on cloture occurs, I intend to vote for cloture. And I urge my colleagues of both parties to do likewise.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The issue before the Senate is the second-degree amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] to a first-degree amendment to the Cuba bill.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be temporarily laid aside that I be allowed up to 10 minutes to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this is really a very gratifying time for me to speak on this subject because it goes back to the time of my first year in the Senate, 1975.

I was put on the space committee by the Democratic steering committee. I did not request to be put on that committee and I did not want to be on it. We did not have much of anything to do.

And so after I had been here for a few months, I went to the chairman of the committee, Ted Moss, who was the senior Senator from Utah at the time, and I said, "Ted, I don't mind telling you I'm bored around here. I have been Governor, and there is a lot of action in the Governor's office. There is none here for a freshman with no clout."

I said I had been reading a theory that has been publicized by two chemists at the University of California-Irvine, named Rowland and Molina. "They have this theory they say they have worked out in a lab that shows"—and at that time this was how simple the idea was to me—"that the hair sprays we use on our hair in the bathroom in the morning over a period of

about 15 years waft their way into the stratosphere and they destroy a three-celled molecule called ozone, and that the ozone layer is what protects us from the ultraviolet rays of the Sun. It seems like an intriguing theory to me, very possibly true, and I would like to be able to chair just some ad hoc hearings and have people come in from around the country to testify for or against the Rowland and Molina theory."

Senator Moss said that was fine, I could do that, but I needed to get a Republican colleague to help me. So I recruited my good friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, who had not been here much longer than I had. I asked him: "Will you join me and we will hold hearings. We will get some atmospheric scientists from around the country to come in and testify." He said he would be glad to.

So we did. We held nine hearings. We had Dr. Elroy from Harvard, who was considered the premier atmospheric scientist in America. We had Dr. Robert Otten, who was the author of the greenhouse theory. And then finally we had Dr. Sherwood Rowland, who, along with Dr. Mario Molina, developed the theory of ozone depletion.

You can imagine how much publicity it got. Senators do not go to a hearing unless there are a lot of television cameras with their red lights on, and there were no television cameras interested in ozone depletion. So we were pretty lonely holding these hearings. And when it was over, I suggested that we offer a bill or an amendment in this Chamber at the earliest possible time to ban or to phase-out the production of what we call CFC's, chlorofluorocarbons, at the earliest possible time.

Senator DOMENICI did not think the hearings were conclusive enough to do that, and I could understand that because there were a lot of people in the country who were very reticent about accepting this theory.

Well, I heard that my colleague, Senator Packwood, who was on the Environment and Public Works Committee at the time, had an interest in it, so I went to see Senator Packwood. I told him about the hearings. I said I thought he and I ought to team up and see if we could not stop the manufacture of these so-called chlorofluorocarbons and he said he thought that it was a great idea. So we spent several hours talking about it. And then we offered the amendment.

And when it came time to vote, Mr. President, that hallway directly in front of me was so full of chemical industry lobbyists you could not get in here to vote. At that time this was a \$2 billion-a-year industry. When I saw that, I did not think we had much chance anyway; but when I saw that crowd out in the hallway, I knew we did not have a chance.

I think we got 32, possibly 35 votes. And believe you me, that was the most